

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Hamilton School, Multi-Purpose Room,
Novato, California
June 19, 2002**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Lance McMahan; Naomi Feger; Ray Zimny; Jim McAlister; Patricia Ryan; Jim Ponton; Marucia Britto; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Matthew McCarron; Patricia Eklund; Theresa McGarry.

RAB Members Absent:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Raymond Seid; Richard A. Draeger; Andre Klein; Sabrina Molinari; Karol Raymer; Jack Walton; Thomas Hinman; Manuel Meir; Joan Dekelbourn.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Jim Lukasko; John Lowe; Neal Navarro; Brad Call; Jennifer Upshaw; J. Barlow; Michael Schum; Jim Davies; Susan Barnes; Laura Herse; Elizabeth Eells; Grace Newell; John Fitzgerald; Kyle Keilman; Tom Roth; Walt Bobkianra; Scott Calliha; Rob Wainwright; Dave Gehis; Maureen Gehis; Ken Prada; Vicki Porada; Phil Smilm.

Welcoming Remarks

Tunstall Lang welcomed the community to the June 19, 2002 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:15 p.m.

USACE/GSA/FUDS Update- Jim McAlister USACE

North Antenna Field

The Corps received comments from the regulators on the draft remedial investigation and will submit their responses to those comments next week. The Corps has also started preliminary work on the Feasibility Study. The current schedule for completion of documentation on the North Antenna Field is shown below:

Remedial Investigation	July 2002
Risk Assessment	September 2002
Feasibility Study	December 2002
Decisions Document	June 2003
OE Clearance	August 2003
Remedial Action	October 2005

Landfill 26

Buffer Trench

The passive design consists of a gravel filled trench with vent pipes and an impermeable barrier. The full length of the trench will be 1,600 feet and the depth will vary with the groundwater level and/or presence of bedrock. The target depth of the trench is 13 feet.

The Corps completed about 1,000 feet of the trench, before weather conditions forced the Corps to stop construction. As of May, the soils were still saturated. The Corps will resume construction of the remaining 600 feet of the trench on July 22, 2002, and will complete its construction this summer. Even if the soils are still somewhat saturated, causing the sides of the trench to slough inward, the Corps will continue with the construction and will simply fill in the larger area with gravel. This scenario would actually provide a larger area in which the methane would disperse. Mr. McAlister used a graphic to show the current extent of the trench.

There was concern expressed to Representative Woolsey about groundwater at the north end of the Landfill. Representative Woolsey asked the Corps to meet with the Water Board to create a comprehensive plan for sampling around the entire perimeter of the Landfill. Representative Woolsey was instrumental to obtaining more funding for this effort, which was not programmed in the Corps budget.

Human Health and Volatile Organic Chemical (VOC) Risk Assessment Near Landfill 26 - Brad Call USACE

Mr. Call began his presentation by stressing that the risk assessment (RA) is in a draft stage, and the regulatory agencies are currently reviewing it. He therefore asked the audience to think of the results presented as preliminary. Mr. Call said he would speak about the background of this effort, the data collection efforts that have occurred to date, how the risk assessment was prepared, and what the preliminary results show—specifically whether or not it is safe for the Hamilton residents to live there.

The issue that led to the RA is that organic compounds were detected in the soil gas at Hamilton Meadows. The Army is committed to working cooperatively with the regulatory agencies and the public to resolve this issue. Based on the data that has been collected to date, and the RA evaluation that has been conducted, the Corps believes that there is no risk to the current or future residents in the Hamilton Meadows area.

Mr. Call explained that Landfill 26 was the garbage dump for the former Hamilton Air Force Base. It was located in the northwest section of the former base, directly north of Hamilton Meadows. The landfill was analyzed during the initial phases of investigative work conducted in the 1980s. As a result of that work, it was decided to place an impermeable cap over the Landfill. The primary contaminant found in the Landfill was petroleum-contaminated soil, but the Corps also found pesticides, PCBs, solvents, and metals. No fuel storage or industrial activities were ever conducted in this area. Former

Army uses in the Hamilton Meadows area included barracks, offices, athletic fields, and vehicle wash racks.

In 1999, routine soil gas monitoring detected increased concentrations of methane at the Landfill. That led to follow-up investigations to locate the spatial extent of the methane and to also look for organic compounds. These investigations led the Army into Hamilton Meadows, where low concentrations of organic compounds were detected in the soil gas as well as methane. Even though the concentrations were low, the Army decided that they should be evaluated to determine if there were any potential adverse health effects.

The Army collected data from shallow soil gas measuring probes. Mr. Call explained that soil gas is basically the gaseous substance that resides in the small spaces between particles of soil. The Army worked very closely with the regulatory agencies on all aspects of this work, from data collection through the interpretation of the results. Before the Army installed the probes, the Army did collect some preliminary soil and groundwater data, as well as other soil gas samples. In analyzing that data, the Army did not identify any high concentrations of the chemicals that would indicate that large amounts of the chemicals are present. The soil concentrations that have been detected are consistent with common residential activities, such as gasoline constituents and chlorinated solvents that are used in cleaning fluids.

The Army is continuing to evaluate the origins of the organic chemicals. The obvious candidate is Landfill 26, but the Army also believes that the former gas station to the south could be a source, as could small spills in Hamilton Meadows and/or in the buffer zone that lies between Landfill 26 and Hamilton Meadows. These potential sources will be assessed further during upcoming monitoring events.

An RA is an evaluation of the potential health risk associated with actual or potential exposure to chemicals. The results of the RA are used to decide what sort of remediation is required, if any. An RA is based on the potential cancer-causing effect of a given compound, based on the probability that a given compound would increase the risk of cancer beyond what already exists in the natural environment. The existing risk is called the baseline. The RA looks at what increase, if any, can be associated with the chemicals found in the shallow soil gas found at Hamilton Meadows.

The American Cancer Society estimates that each person has a 1 in 3 chance of developing cancer, at some point in his or her life, or 333,333 chances in one million. The Hamilton Meadows RA assumes that if the calculations show an increase in risk of more than 100 in one million, both federal and state regulatory policy would require additional remediation of the site. If the risk is less than one in one million, no further action would be required. If the results are between one in one million and 100 in one million, each situation must be judged on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Call used a graph to illustrate this concept.

The two likely exposure scenarios are soil gas moving into a residence or moving into the outdoor air. Models were used to predict this potential chemical movement, and to

evaluate the potential health effects associated with it. The results showed that the estimated range for excess lifetime cancer risk is five chances in one billion (minimum) to four chances in one million (maximum). Although the higher end of the range (four chances in one million) approach the one chance in one million threshold for case-by-case review, the Army conducted the risk assessment using extremely conservative, health-protective methods, to err on the side of safety in accordance with regulatory guidance. Therefore, although the estimated risk is up to four chances in one million, the actual risk will be much lower. For non-cancer effects, the results were all less than a hazard index of one. As stated before, the results indicate that it is safe for current and future residents to live at Hamilton Meadows.

The complete installation of the migration control trench will begin in July 2002 and will be completed this summer. The Army also plans to continue monitoring and has a proposal on the table to conduct quarterly sampling of the shallow soil gas probes. There also will be some additional investigation work to collect groundwater data and perhaps other data of interest to the regulatory agencies.

Summary of Human Health Risk Assessment at the Hamilton Meadows Subdivisions- Dr. Michael Schum, Ph.D., DTSC

Dr. Michael Schum has expertise in inhalation toxicology, in landfill gas issues, and in evaluating indoor air pathways. Dr. Schum explained the four basic steps in a risk assessment process: hazard identification, exposure assessment, toxicity assessment, and risk characterization. The primary chemicals of concern are VOCs in the soil gas. The data is based on samples taken from 21 shallow soil gas probes, placed at approximately three-foot depths, with some deeper probes to examine stratification of the data. The Army used a sophisticated and sensitive analysis method, known as EPA T0-14, which can detect chemicals to the sub part-per-billion range. As a result of its sensitivity, the system often detects more chemicals than were previously identified, although the quantities present are not environmentally threatening.

The sampling was done on two separate occasions; once in November 2001 and once in December 2001. The sample analysis found 35 VOCs, although the distribution was patchy, and some chemicals were only detected one or two times. Twenty-three of the chemicals were found in at least half of the samples, four were detected in every sample, and four more were found in 20 out of 21 samples. No clear patterns or gradients were observed, although soil gas does tend to travel by preferential pathways. Most of the chemicals were detected in the November sampling period. In the December sampling period fewer chemicals were detected and the concentration was generally an order of magnitude less.

The most common chemicals detected were fuel-related compounds, freons, methane and lots of alcohols and ketones (isopropanol and acetone). Isopropanol and acetone were the chemicals that had the highest concentration, and these alcohols and ketones are not particularly toxic.

Step two, the exposure assessment, is really the heart of a risk assessment. Dr. Schum explained that the exposure locations were identified by the inhalation of indoor air, outdoor air, and the vapors during potential construction excavation activities. The populations of concern are residents of the development and on-site construction workers. The exposure assessment uses conservative exposure factors to estimate inhalation rates, exposure frequency, and exposure duration, and is based on an estimated Average Daily Intake rate. The analysis assumes that a person is exposed 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for 30 years. The risk estimates are based upon these assumptions.

Estimated indoor air concentrations are predicted from the USEPA recommended models, which use very conservative model assumptions. The estimates are based on an attenuation coefficient, which is a ratio of the concentration of indoor air to the concentration measured in soil gas. The concentrations measured in soil gas are at least 1,000 greater than the concentration measured in indoor air, so the attenuation coefficient is at least 1,000-fold. For the main chemicals of concern, the results of this risk assessment show that the predicted indoor air concentrations are at least an order of magnitude lower than a typical ambient level. Therefore, it would be virtually impossible to differentiate any increment from soil gas because of the higher concentrations already present in ambient air.

Because the soil gas concentration is so patchy, the risk assessment actually did a separate risk calculation for each sampling location. Each separate calculation included chemicals that were not detected at a given sampling location but were present at adjacent sample locations. These additional chemicals were included to be conservative, using the premise that the chemicals may actually have been present at a concentration that the laboratory analysis could not detect.

The toxicity assessment focuses on chronic long-term exposures, typically for exposures on the order of months to years, and they are based on the average daily intake rates. The toxicity assessment does not take in potential short-term effects, because these types of contaminants we are looking at do have short-term effects but only at extremely high concentrations, which are not an issue here at Hamilton. The assessment also takes into consideration children, the elderly, and people with respiratory ailments. The toxicity factors used, which are put forward by USEPA and CalEPA, already take into account these types of sensitive receptors.

The estimated lifetime excess cancer risk is less than one in one million at 18 of 21 of the sample locations. The highest risk at any location is approximately four in one million. The three main risk chemicals are 1,3-Butadiene, Chloroform and Benzene. These chemicals are very common and are monitored statewide by the ARB. The ambient concentrations of Butadiene and Benzene, due primarily to vehicle exhaust, are significantly greater than the predicted indoor air concentration from soil gas that was measured. The predicted chloroform concentration is similar to what is seen in indoor air sample. (Chloroform is commonly found at concentrations one order of magnitude

higher indoors than outdoors because it comes from highly chlorinated water used for showering, dishwashers, bleach in the laundry, etc.)

Based on measured concentrations of VOCs in soil gas, the Army does not see a current health risk in either indoor or outdoor air or to potential construction workers. However, there is enough uncertainty and the long-term soil gas concentrations could be variable, so the situation does warrant continued monitoring.

Janice Farlo: Is inhalation the only pathway of exposure to the chemicals you mentioned?
Dr. Schum: Yes, inhalation is the main source of exposure. Exposure through skin or ingestion would be very low and there would be no source of direct contact with the soil.

Janice Farlo: You mentioned that the model looks at cancer and non-cancer health effects. What types of non-cancer diseases are programmed into the model? Did you look at asthma or birth defects?

Dr. Schum: Each chemical has its own type of health effects end form. For example, learning disabilities are associated with exposure to lead, although we don't have lead at this site. Similarly, for chemicals that are present, non-cancer health effects are based on exposure thresholds, because the body can detoxify a lot of the chemical before it becomes an immunological threat. The thresholds establish a level of say 1 mg per kg of body weight is an acceptable intake of chemical X. The levels of chemical X present at Hamilton do not even approach the threshold, so it is irrelevant to talk about what the end form is for that chemical. Once you've had a chance to review the risk assessment, we can work with you to answer any questions you have and can also point you to some websites that offer additional information on the subject.

Janice Farlo: You mentioned that the model factors in the sensitivity of elders and children. We seem to be moving toward recognizing that lower thresholds levels still have health effects. How was this put into the model?

Dr. Schum: The toxicity factors are developed by USEPA and CalEPA. Most of the toxicity factors come from laboratory studies on animals, primarily rodents. The dosage is then related to a body size that is appropriate for humans, and an uncertainty factor is added in for sensitive populations. For each chemical there is a health effect end form, for example it might be based on a developmental effect found in fetal mice, and would represent the type of potential human health effect possible based on exposure to that specific chemical. There must be a minimum exposure level before that type of effect is seen.

Grace Young: What type of equipment was stored in Hamilton Meadows?

Brad Call: Vehicles, generators, weapons and tools were stored in this area.

John Fitzgerald: Has there been any analysis performed in the vents?

Mr. McAlister: The Army conducted one round of sampling, which resulted in very low detections of methane in two of the vents. The Army will conduct a second round of sampling next week. The Army doesn't have enough data yet to make any statement about the effectiveness of the trench.

John Fitzgerald: Are there any efforts to work with the media to address the recent negative press Hamilton has been receiving?

Mr. McAlister: Both NBC and the Marin IJ are present at this meeting. We have had some very good news in relation to Hamilton Meadows tonight, and I would hope that an article would come out in the next day or two that reflected these preliminary results.

Dr. Schum: I have a lot of experience with school sites around the state, and based on the preliminary results we have obtained, we would be allowed to build a school on the location where your house is located. They would likely ask that we continue to monitor, but the risk assessment would be sufficient to build a school on this site.

Patricia Eklund: When will the buffer trench be finished?

Mr. McAlister: The digging of the trench will take two to three weeks. After this, the impermeable barrier will be custom ordered, and that should take about 60 days for it to be constructed. Then the barrier will be installed. I don't have a fixed date on how long that will take.

Dave Gehis: Have you done any longitudinal studies about the effects of VOC on residents who were stationed here for 5, 10, or 15 years?

Dr. Schum: DTSC doesn't do those types of studies. If there is a cancer cluster in the neighborhood, we request input from the County or State Department of Health Services.

Marucia Britto: If there was an increase in the different chemical concentrations at Hamilton Meadows, how would the Army address this?

Mr. McAlister: The Army would look for a trend and would assess the cause of the increase to determine a response. Any action would be on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the regulatory agencies.

Preston Cook: Was there any risk assessment done prior to the development of Shea Homes, and what were the results?

Mr. Call: There were some investigations done at Hamilton Meadows in 1996 and some risk evaluation work was done based on the investigation results. Based on the results of that evaluation there were some excavations that took place, excavation of some accumulated soil and soil in culverts where oils and metals had accumulated. None of this work was directly comparable to what we are doing now, nothing having to do with soil gas.

Preston Cook: But presumably the risk assessment at that time would allow for the developer to come in and build houses?

Mr. Call: Correct. Based on the knowledge that we had at that point, the area was safe. The methane readings that prompted this current action occurred in 1999, after the transfer of the Shea Homes property had taken place.

Preston Cook: So the migration of the methane happened over a two-year period of time?

Mr. Call: This would be difficult to determine. It is possible that some conditions changed at the landfill over time.

Dr. Schum: I've been involved in the risk assessments for GSA Phase I, GSA Phase II, BRAC Property, DoD Novato and now Hamilton Meadows. The assessment for GSA Phase II was focused more on surface contaminants. They had very little soil gas data, as they were focusing on stuff that was found in the soil, and the former skeet range. If they were to do a soil gas survey at that time, they would have used a less sensitive method that would have detected two chemicals: the acetone and isopropanol. We wouldn't have even seen these other ones. That's how much the technology has advanced since 1996.

Preston Cook: Shea Homes decided they would not sell or build anymore homes. Was this influenced by the federal government or was it solely a decision made by Shea Homes?

Mr. McAlister: Shea Homes made this decision independently. The Corps did not recommend that they stop building or stop sales.

Preston Cook: If you had in 1996 the information you have now, would you have recommended not occupying these homes?

Mr. McAlister: No. I think the risk assessment shows that the area is safe for people to live, and that there are no long-term health risks.

Theresa McGarry: Shea Homes approached DTSC to ask if they should stop building. DTSC did not make any recommendation to Shea Homes. We felt it would be a good thing to get more data on the methane to find out where it is going. I think we supported them in slowing down, but we never made an official recommendation that they should stop building. And with the news tonight, I don't foresee making any recommendation that they shouldn't continue building or selling homes.

Army BRAC- HAAF Update: Hugh Ashley, BRAC Environmental Engineer (BEE)

Documentation and Field Work

Mr. Ashley introduced himself and identified the BRAC areas on the Hamilton property, along with the BRAC office which located out on the airfield.

Documentation

Main Airfield Inboard Area Site Record of Decision/ Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP)

The public comment period on the ROD/RAP extended from August 20 to October 18, 2001. A public meeting was held on September 4, 2001 to explain the document and to receive public comment. The Army received several comment letters on the ROD/RAP. The responses to those comments were forwarded to regulators for review in February 2002. Modifications to the ROD/RAP are currently under discussion between the Army and DTSC.

Main Airfield and Coastal Salt Marsh Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET)

The public comment draft FOSET was forwarded to the regulators for review on March 1, 2002. The public review period will hopefully begin this Summer 2002 since the Army would like to transfer the property this fall and the Coastal Conservancy would like to

complete their preliminary actions in preparation for receiving dredge material starting in Fall 2003. The discussions are continuing between the Army and DTSC. The FOSET needs to be finalized to support the transfer.

The Environmental Baseline Survey for the Main Airfield Parcel (EBS)

The document provides a snapshot in time of what the property condition is at the time of transfer. The EBS was forwarded to the regulators for review on March 28, 2002. The Army expects to receive comments from the regulators on this document in the next month or two. The EBS will be released for public review in support of the FOSET.

Hospital Hill

The Army has now signed the FOST and the transfer documents have been forwarded to the City of Novato.

Petroleum Oil Lubricant Hill (POL Hill)

There have been two rounds of groundwater sampling, one back in September 2001 and February 2002. The initial data report for the sampling in September was provided for review by the regulators. The report based on the data collected in February has not gone out yet; it will be distributed to the regulators by the end of June.

Coastal Salt Marsh

The Coastal Salt Marsh Feasibility Study was forwarded for the regulatory review on April 24, 2002. Comments were received and a response is being prepared. The Coastal Salt Marsh Sampling Data Report is being reviewed by the Army and will be submitted to the regulators at the end of June or early July. The Coastal Salt Marsh Proposed Plan is in review by the Army and is scheduled for public review this summer.

Field Work

Building 82 (BRAC Office) — Some remediation work was done on a transformer. During that remediation, some hydrocarbons were found in the soil. A workplan has been prepared and is in final Army internal review. It will be submitted to the regulators soon, and hopefully work can proceed this summer.

Removal of Asbestos Containing Material – The Army signed a memorandum of agreement with the California Coastal Conservancy to remove all asbestos-containing material from the site prior to transfer. The current scope of work is complete. Three remaining items will be removed this summer: one item is the outfall pipes on the outboard side of the levee, which have a tar coating containing less than 10% asbestos. The tar was used for corrosion protection of the pipe. A boiler in Building 84 had sheet asbestos in it that will be removed, and at the shack at Revetment 10 or the fire practice burn area, asbestos was identified in the mastic that had been used to secure floor tiles.

Main Airfield Inboard Sites Remediation – The current effort includes the work identified in the Inboard Area Sites ROD/RAP: Building 41 pump station demolition, Spoil Pile F and Revetments 6 & 7. Excavations at all locations were completed and confirmation samples were collected. Confirmation sampling data indicated that the actions were very

successful. Soils have been stockpiled for future disposition. The removal report is scheduled to begin Army internal review this month.

Next Steps

Inboard Property

The Army will complete the remedial actions as defined in the ROD/RAP, including disposal of the soils currently stockpiled in the revetment area. The Army will complete a FOSET for public review and will hold a public meeting on that document. The Army also plans to complete the Environmental Baseline Survey. Once all of this documentation is complete, the property can be transferred this fall.

Coastal Salt Marsh

The Army will complete a sampling data report, based on data collected in December and January by the Corps Sacramento District. The Army has also completed the Feasibility Study, which includes options for remediation, and the Proposed Plan, which presents the recommended remedial alternatives. The Army is currently preparing the Decision Document, which will present the selected remedy. The Army hopes to have this document out to the public this summer, in preparation for taking action in the Coastal Salt Marsh in September 1 through January 31, 2003.

Matt McCarron: What is the difference between a FOSET and a FOST?

Mr. Ashley: FOSET is Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer and a FOST is Finding of Suitability for Transfer. My understanding is the Army requires this document either way. An early transfer is when the transfer happens before all remedial requirements are completed. It doesn't relieve the Army from doing the remedial work.

Matt McCarron: Once the transfer is complete does the project move from a BRAC program to a FUDS program?

Mr. McAlister: No, it doesn't. FUDS has a very specific definition. I believe a property has to have transferred prior to sometime in the mid-80s for it to fall under the FUDS program.

Mr. McCarron: Landfill 26 started before the BRAC property?

Mr. McAlister: Landfill 26 is part of the GSA property, which has been under the FUDS program. The only true FUDS site on Hamilton is the North Antenna Field, which was transferred to the State in the 80s. For the GSA parcels, there was pressure from developers through Congress to get Hamilton ready to transfer. Congress directed the Corps of Engineers to use the FUDS program funds to clean up these sites.

Matt McCarron: Where will the funding come from after the transfer?

Mr. McAlister: The funding would still come from BRAC funding and not FUDS sources.

Matt McCarron: In the Coastal Salt Marsh, does the area you studied include the landfill that's out there?

Mr. Ashley: The East Levee Construction Debris Disposal Area? Yes, the workplan covers this area as well.

Matt McCarron: Was there once a refueling area in the docks?

Mr. Ashley: There may have been above ground tanks, but we're not certain.

Question: When the salt marsh is available for review, how will the public know that it is available?

Mr. Ashley: There will be a newspaper announcement and it will be available in the BRAC library and in the Novato public library.

Tom Roth: Is there still controversy about who has final authority to approve the remediation plan?

Mr. Ashley: There were discussions last week with the Army attorneys addressing this issue.

Mr. McMahan: The discussions did not resolve the issue, but the Army is going to provide us with a revised MOA by the end of June. This issue needs to be resolved before the property can be transferred to the Coastal Conservancy to build the wetland.

BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Update - Jim Ponton

Jim Ponton thanked everyone in the RAB, the community, Tom Roth, and Representative Woolsey who helped the RWQCB to secure the funding for the Army Corps to investigate the landfill and the soil gas associated with the landfill.

The risk assessment was very well presented by DTSC and the Army Corps. Regarding the gas station site and the remediation of the groundwater, there has been a delay in getting the air compressor delivered to the site. The air compressors will support the air sparging system that is designed to remove additional MTBE from the groundwater plume. The air compressors are scheduled to be delivered in early July, and the system may be up and running by the end of July.

Theresa McGarry: Regarding Landfill 26, Mr. Schum has done a wonderful job, and Ms. McGarry appreciates hearing the good news regarding the results at the site. There are still some uncertainties and Ms. McGarry is encouraged to hear that the Army will continue to monitor. DTSC also supports Shea Homes conducting more data collection in the area, and the agencies will consider any data that is collected at the site. Mr. Call did an excellent job.

Naomi Feger: What is the update regarding the complaint of the lack of fish in Bel Marine Keys and the possible dumping in that area?

Mr. Zimny: Currently the Army Corps is looking at the past usage of the area and is conducting an investigation.

Mr. Ashley: A community member originally approached the RAB about the lack of fish in Bel Marine Keys lagoon and thought the "problem" may be from Hamilton. In the late 1980s he also had been hired by the Federal Government as a consultant to investigate out-of-specification equipment and materials (expired shelf life dates) at Hamilton. He

also was aware of practices that he considered inappropriate and was told that there had been dumping in this area (pointing to the area west of the north end runway on the Hamilton BRAC photograph). The area in question is on the west side of the airfield at the end of the runway. We have already collected samples from this area during previous investigations and so we have some data.

Administrative Issues - Tunstall Lang

Tunstall Lung announced that the next meeting will be held on August, 28 2002. The location will be determined at a later date. Meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.